



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,160	04/15/2004	Hua-Jun Zeng	MSI-1892US	8619
22801	7590	10/29/2008	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			SANDERS, AARON J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2168			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
10/20/2008	PAPER			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/826,160	ZENG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	AARON SANDERS	2168	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Aaron Sanders

(3) Benjamin Keim

(2) Tim Vo

(4) Dino Kujundzit

Date of Interview: 14 October 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.45 and 50.

Identification of prior art discussed: Simoudis, U.S. 5,224,206 and Vaithyanathan, U.S. 5,819,258.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative gave a brief overview of the claimed invention and discussed how the claim amendments might overcome the prior art of record. The Examiner agreed that the amendments overcame the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection, but did not overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections. The Examiner recommended that Applicant amend the claims to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections and more specifically claim the novelty of the invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Aaron Sanders/  
14 October 2008